

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending.

The specification was objected to, and has been amended to overcome the objections.

Support for claim 9 is found at page 9, lines 32-34 and in Fig. 5.

Figure 1 has been marked as Prior Art, and the specification has been appropriately amended on page 6.

No new subject matter has been added to the specification.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Lin US patent no. 6,669,328. In order to sustain a §102 rejection of independent claim 1, each and every feature of the claim must be taught by the reference. This rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

Claims 2-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Lin. In determining a prima facie case for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, it is necessary to show that a combination of prior art teachings is proper, and that those teachings are sufficient to *suggest* making the claimed modifications to one of ordinary skill in the art. This rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 1 has been currently amended to recite a wiper assembly comprising:

- (1) at least one wiper blade;
- (2) a rigid blade holder for supporting the wiper blade;
- (3) at least one rigid clamping block extending a length of the wiper blade for clamping and securing the wiper blade between the blade holder and the clamping block.

Support for the claim amendments is found, for example in Fig. 5, which shows a clamping block 4 (see Parts List on page 14) which extends the length of the wiper blade(s) 1

along the blade holder 2 for clamping and securing the wiper blade between the blade holder and the clamping block.

Lin discloses a base or blade holder 314 (see Figs. 3A, 3B) having a groove 314a into which the wiper blade 302 is insert from one end. A positioning bolt 307 is inserted through a positioning hole 305 to secure the wiper blade into the assembly.

#### Distinctions from Lin

Claim 1 recites both a blade holder 2 and a clamping block 4 which both extend the length of the wiper blade 1 (see Fig. 5). In Lin the base 314 extends the length of the wiper blade, but the positioning bolt 307 acts as a pin and does not extend the length of the wiper blade. Moreover claim 1 includes a blade holder 2 and clamping block 4 which act together as a 2 piece base unit for supporting the wiper blade. The 2 piece unit of claim 1 clamps (i.e. by compression) and secures the wiper blade between block 4 and holder 2, so that no additional pin or bolt 307 (Lin) is necessary to prevent movement of the blade.

Lin provides:

(1) the base 314 having a groove 314a which acts to prevent movement of the wiper blade perpendicular to direction 350; and

(2) the pin/bolt 307 which acts to prevent movement of the wiper blade in the direction 350. Both of these features are required for the Lin wiper blade to operate in a secure manner.

In contrast, claim 1 does not recite or require a bolt/pin to prevent movement of the wiper blade in the direction of the length of the wiper blade.

Applicant believes that Lin does not teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. Furthermore, since Lin has solved the problem of unwanted wiper blade movement in its own

way with structure that differs from claim 1, there is no need, suggestion or motivation in Lin to come up with the different solution and structure that is presented in claim 1. As such, Applicants believe that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are patentable over Lin.

A Letter to the Office Draftsman, a formal Replacement Sheet, and an informal Figure 1 with proposed changes marked in red accompany this response.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed but is not considered material to the patentability of the invention.

Please treat this paper as a Petition for Extension of Time for responding to the Office Action mailed on November 5, 2006, and charge any fees due under this general authorization to Deposit Account No. 13-3377.

It should be noted that the above arguments are directed towards certain patentable distinctions between the claims and the prior art cited. However, the patentable distinctions between the pending claims and the prior art cited are not necessarily limited to those discussed above.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection of the Office Action has been addressed and overcome so that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, withdraw the rejections and/or objections, and pass the application to issue. Should questions arise during examination, the Examiner is welcome to contact the applicant's attorney as listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert A. Sabourin". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Robert A. Sabourin  
Reg. No. 35,344

Agfa Corporation  
Law & Patent Department  
200 Ballardvale Street  
Wilmington, MA. 01887-1069

Tel: 978-284-5604

RAS/pc